

**Wu, Jennifer**

---

**From:** SEEDS Joshua <SEEDS.Joshua@deq.state.or.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 18, 2014 5:06 PM  
**To:** jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov  
**Cc:** Palmer, John; Henning, Alan; Wu, Jennifer; SEEDS Joshua  
**Subject:** RE: Draft BOF presentation - comments by Thursday noon please

There is a stray empty text box on slide 1.

Slide 2: Challenging in what way? Is it a question of the effort, or a question of whether the standard will pass consultation? I suggest you clarify.

Slide 8: I suggest clarifying what is meant by “baseline”. Is that pre-settlement by European-Americans?

Slide 9: Again, in what way would it complicate consultation? Does it just make things less clear, or does it increase the probability that the temp standard won’t stand up to consultation, or what? Also, too much use of the word “increase” in the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet.

Slide 11: Same mystery text box as the #1.

Would some kind of site-specific processes result in more ESA consultations or more risk of other restrictions on activities? What are the consequences (if known) of “complicating” consultation?

Looks good, on the mark generally.

Thanks,  
Josh

---

**From:** Jeffrey Lockwood - NOAA Federal [mailto:jeffrey.lockwood@noaa.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 18, 2014 4:51 PM  
**To:** Palmer, John; SEEDS Joshua; Alan Henning; Jennifer Wu  
**Cc:** Kim Kratz - NOAA Federal  
**Subject:** Draft BOF presentation - comments by Thursday noon please

Any concerns or suggestions?

Sorry for the short turnaround - I thought I sent this out earlier today.

Jeff Lockwood  
[503-231-2249](tel:503-231-2249)